

Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)
Idaho Geospatial Committee (IGC)

Meeting Minutes
(Approved September 18, 2002)

April 4, 2002

The April 4, 2002 Idaho Geospatial Committee meeting was held from 1:35 to 5:00 p.m., East Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building, Boise, ID.

CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Liza Fox, Chair, welcomed members and others in attendance and called the meeting to order.

ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Mr. Mike Beaty, USDI Bureau of Reclamation
Mr. Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff
Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho Senate
Mr. Joe Calderwood, USDA Forest Service
Ms. Liza Fox, Idaho Transportation Department
Mr. Tracy Fuller, USGS National Mapping Division
Mr. Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello
Mr. Frank Mynar, Idaho Power
Mr. Tony Morse, Department of Water Resources
Mr. Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Disaster Services
Mr. Craig Rindlisbacher, Madison County and City of Rexburg
Ms. Carol Silvers, Idaho State Library
*Mr. Sheldon Bluestein, Ada County

*Designate

Members Absent:

Ms. Diane Holloran, Power Engineers
Dr. Piotr Jankowski, University of Idaho
Mr. Mike McDowell, Kootenai County
Mr. Frank Roberts, Coeur d'Alene Tribe

Others Present:

Ms. Janet Cheney, Bonneville County
Mr. Jason Carr, IDWR Research Institute (IWRI)
Ms. Emily Gales, ITRMC Staff
Mr. Dave Gruenhagen, Department of Lands
Ms. Cindy Lou McDonald, Idaho State Tax Commission

MOTION TO APPROVE FEBRUARY 7, 2002 MINUTES

Jonathan Perry moved and Carol Silvers seconded a motion to approve the February 7, 2002 Idaho Geospatial Committee Meeting Minutes, and the motion passed unanimously.

GEOSPATIAL DATA CLEARINGHOUSE DISCUSSION

Liza recapped actions pertaining to a February 7, 2002 IGC meeting agenda item, 'Next Steps', with regard to the clearinghouse discussion:

"IGC members were advised to discuss the draft MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] with their respective stakeholder groups. Nathan would be responsible for editing the MOU, as discussed previously."

To facilitate this discussion, individuals present (who represented IGC stakeholder groups) were asked to identify themselves, along with any issues, concerns, and/or recommendations regarding the Clearinghouse Subcommittee's February 7th Report and Recommendations.

Federal

Tracy Fuller, US Geological Survey (USGS) National Mapping Division, received four responses to notices he sent to area federal personnel i.e. the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and others. Tracy deduced the responding agencies were in favor of INSIDE Idaho being the state clearinghouse: those who responded had used the site with great success, and appreciated how it worked. Also, a recommendation was made to explore the implementation of redundancy e.g. a mirror server located at another site.

Joe Calderwood, US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service (FS), advised that, so long as there was clear, centralized state authority and direction e.g. standards, procedures, and identification of available funding**, the FS had no preference as to the location of the state clearinghouse.

Mike Beaty, US Department of Interior (USDI) Bureau of Reclamation, advised that everyone he had consulted within the USDI had long been supportive of INSIDE Idaho and using a university as a clearinghouse. Additionally, it serves as a valuable resource, and assisted the USDI in making data available publicly that may not otherwise be readily accessible (due to security and/or funding issues). Mike mentioned that Lily Wai (Project Director for INSIDE Idaho) had previously addressed USDI concerns regarding long-term viability and stability.

Discussion: Referencing federal geospatial clearinghouses already in place i.e. the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Geospatial Data Clearinghouse, the USGS National Geospatial Data Clearinghouse, **Senator Hal Bunderson**, Idaho State Senate, inquired as to an approach that could be made toward cost sharing**. Tracy commented that there had not been enough discussion on the subject of funding mechanisms for an Idaho clearinghouse to respond to this inquiry. Mike advised the Bureau of Reclamation (BR) actively supported other states' efforts in this area by regularly contributing BR funds through cooperative agreements, which were managed as grants. He warned, though, that when the BR budget was "tight", grants were first to be eliminated. Mike also noted the importance of the existence of a chartered, state-supported organization [i.e. the IGC] to whom cost-sharing or grant monies were provided.

Tribal

Although there was **no official response**, **Carol Silvers** (Idaho State Library) advised that IGC member Frank Roberts (Coeur d'Alene Tribe) had received no negative responses after sending a notice to his constituents regarding the Clearinghouse Subcommittee recommendations.

Higher Education

Liza referenced a letter received from Idaho State University (ISU) on February 7, 2002, which expressed several concerns related to the clearinghouse. A letter addressing those concerns was drafted to ISU (from Liza). In response, Keith Weber (Lab Director, ISU) wrote that he believed that a clearinghouse should not be perceived as a "one-stop-shop for geospatial data", but rather it should act as a broker for the data. Weber ended the letter by stating that "the universities and colleges of Idaho favored INSIDE Idaho as the designated geospatial clearinghouse."

Discussion points:

- Function and structure attributes of a clearinghouse. A clearinghouse is a portal concept (distributed architecture); INSIDE Idaho would be designated as a one-stop shop where anyone could access the data from a central place, but the data itself might reside at various agencies.
- Use of a federal clearinghouse. There was more than one point of contact (clearinghouse) for federal data.

Private Sector

Frank Mynar, Idaho Power, advised he had not solicited or received comments from other private sector organizations. He informed the Committee that he felt the issue was not a matter of location, but of availability of data. He also conveyed that INSIDE Idaho was doing good work, and had already made great strides in putting the clearinghouse together. Also, it made sense to continue with what was being done there, rather than start over somewhere else. It was also mentioned that the vast majority of Idaho Power's data was proprietary; and data made available to the clearinghouse by Idaho Power would be minimal.

Discussion points:

- Private sector participation. IGC members **Diane Holloran** (Power Engineers) and Frank M. had been struggling to identify private sector stakeholders. Per Diane, Power Engineers, being a developer of data for its clients, was more a consultant to the IGC. Idaho Power, however, was a user of data, as well as a developer of specific in-house data. Consequently, the utility company would likely be users of the clearinghouse, rather than participants.
- The Department of Lands' (Lands) Integrated State Lands Project. Per **Dave Gruenhagen**, Lands was revamping its site to facilitate data download. Dave added that there needed to be a "signpost" located on the clearinghouse site, as there were "mountains of data" available on the Internet.
- Proprietary data. Typically, private companies were not in favor of releasing proprietary data. The same could be said of local governments, as proprietary data was used as a source of revenue.

Local

Craig Rindlisbacher, Madison County and the City of Rexburg, had spoken with many local government people, as well as a newly formed county mappers committee, on the clearinghouse issue. Though he had not heard any objections, Craig was concerned that those he spoke with did not have a good understanding of all the related issues. He did receive positive comments with regard to interaction/experience with INSIDE Idaho. Craig noted that the designation of one place to search for information was extremely important to local government. He agreed the proposal, as presented, adhered to the mission of the IGC well; was in accordance with the mission of the University of Idaho (U of I) Library; and was a good example of leveraging existing resources to accomplish the goals of the IGC.

Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello, contacted several city people involved with GIS. Issues identified are as follows:

- Most data on the clearinghouse was not expected to be to the accuracy cities are interested in, as most cities operate on a very different level of accuracy than do federal, state, and county entities: prefer half-foot pixel resolution in aerial photography, and COGOed (COGO=coordinate geometry) parcels rather than digitized.
- Nathan's vision, as State GIS Coordinator, of the direction he wanted to take the state. To that extent, Nathan's support of the clearinghouse location at the U of I was an important part of the cities' endorsement to move forward with the Clearinghouse Subcommittee's recommendations.
- Funding** and Stability. Eventually, funding would have to become an integral part of how this facility would be maintained and carried on.
- Staffing. Cities preferred not to have the clearinghouse staffed by a private entity, as likelihood of the elimination of funding** was greater.
- Accessibility. Per **Janet Cheney**, Bonneville County, some counties suggested that standards be set for clearinghouse data to ensure an open format, rather than proprietary.
- Liability issues. Local governments were concerned about what information can and cannot be released by law.

Dennis also noted that the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) was excited about the prospect of a site, and would benefit from it. An INEEL staff member did question, however, why the Idaho State Library was not chosen as the location for a state clearinghouse. Per Carol, who served as Co-Chair of the Clearinghouse Subcommittee, the State Library was not chosen because: INSIDE Idaho was already built; efforts toward the project had been in place for three years; the U of I had already made a significant financial investment; infrastructure and IT support in place; and it made sense to build upon what the University had already accomplished.

Sheldon Bluestein, Ada County, noted that beyond hardware and software issues. The most important issue, he said, was the skill level of those administering the site. For instance, whether the people serving the data should be more skilled at cataloging and receiving the data, or using the data. It was suggested an independent steering committee be established to oversee the clearinghouse operation and take a leadership role in the future. Overall, Sheldon was in support of the plan as written.

In clarification, Liza expressed that **the clearinghouse, as it stood then, did not meet the direct data needs of local government**. Carol advised the U of I was very interested in collecting any information available. Further, data that would be satisfactory for county use would need to be contributed by the counties. To the contrary, some counties use data as a revenue source.

Discussion points:

- USGS Spatial Data Transfer Standard (SDTS); OpenGIS® Specifications of the Open GIS Consortium, Inc. (Open Geospatial Interoperability Specification Consortium, or OGC – an international industry consortium aimed at growing interoperability for technologies involving spatial information and location.)
 - Tracy advised USGS standards would most likely go toward OGC standards in the near future.
 - Carol assured the Committee that U of I staff was monitoring, in support of, and would comply with whatever standards were identified.
- Data types being served*. Joe advised the FS had different types of data that were served for different purposes; and different clearinghouse structures may serve one entity better than another. He noted that a distributed network worked very well for that type of uncontrolled data. Other types of data that become a data structure built for multiple uses, such as standard data sets and value-added data sets, were better served from a more centralized location with a steward for particular data.
- Benefit to local governments. Local government data had not been rejected, but not sought after.

*It was decided the clearinghouse steering committee, when identified, should explore this issue.

State

After hearing the comments and concerns thus far, Carol stated that she still believed the recommendations made on February 7th to be valid. She then chose to abstain from comments until hearing from all stakeholders present.

Jonathan Perry, Bureau of Disaster Services, echoed Dennis' earlier concerns of liability issues (see Local).

Tony Morse, Department of Water Resources, informed the Committee that most state agencies were in support of INSIDE Idaho as a state clearinghouse. Some issues identified (pro and con) are as follows:

- INSIDE Idaho is a dedicated clearinghouse that works; the state should build upon its existing investment in INSIDE Idaho, rather than try to recreate from scratch.
- A clearinghouse should serve only metadata (not thematic data).
- Some agencies do not have the resources to serve data; the idea of INSIDE Idaho as a repository for thematic data, as well as a signpost pointing to other locations, was favored.
- There was no GIS strategic plan that included a clearinghouse. Before any decisions were made, it was suggested the term 'clearinghouse be defined', and an explanation of how it would fit into an overall GIS strategic plan be prepared.
- A state clearinghouse should be located in Boise. (INSIDE Idaho is located in Moscow, Idaho.)
- There should be more discussions about the meaning and role of a clearinghouse before any vote was taken by the IGC. Per Tony, the clearinghouse concept was not sufficiently well defined in the State of Idaho so that it was reasonable to vote whether INSIDE Idaho should have that designation.
- Funding**. INSIDE Idaho did not rely on a firm funding source and was too expensive to operate.
- A state clearinghouse should be run with existing GIS staffing resources within state agencies.

Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff, mentioned some state agencies were focused on use of the term 'clearinghouse'. He relayed suggestions that the term was ambiguous to some, and that 'geospatial library' might serve as a better term. (Liza noted that the state clearinghouse would house more than geospatial information. Nathan withdrew his suggestion, as it was also noted that the issue of terminology would best be handled by a steering committee.) Another suggestion forwarded to Nathan was to build another clearinghouse within the Department of Administration. The Division of Information Technology and Communication Services (DITCS) was consulted and cited a lack of funding, personnel, bandwidth, etc. within the Department for this purpose.

Senator Bunderson noted private sector interest in this area. Also, with regard to clearinghouse terminology, the IGC must have a vision of – and consider – who the customers would be; how they will perceive a clearinghouse; and what would make access easy for them. There was more discussion on the types of users who would access the clearinghouse.

**The Clearinghouse Subcommittee did not address funding in the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) presented on February 7th. There were no plans for the Committee to take a vote with regard to funding.

MOTION TO ACCEPT CLEARINGHOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion points prior to final vote:

- Lands' reservations to the Subcommittee recommendations.
- Clearinghouse versus GIS center. The issue of a GIS center was not incorporated into the Subcommittee's vision. Accordingly, at the IGC's February 7th meeting, it was decided that Nathan would address this with the ITRMC at its February 20th meeting. If supported, Nathan would *"perform research/needs analysis on the Subcommittee's third recommendation, to address the need for GIS technical services and support for a clearinghouse – a state GIS center."*
- Clearinghouse objectives. Carol read aloud the objectives listed in the draft MOU, presented on February 7th.

Jonathan Perry moved and Mike Beaty seconded a motion to accept the IGC Clearinghouse Subcommittee recommendations to: 1) Formalize location of clearinghouse at the University of Idaho Library; 2) Endorse the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), at least in principle, as revised by Subcommittee; 3) Investigate options for legal authorization for clearinghouse; and 4) Address need for GIS technical services and support; and the motion passed unanimously.

MOTION TO IDENTIFY SUBCOMMITTEE TO ADDRESS CLEARINGHOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION #3, and REQUIRE PARTICIPATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LANDS

Liza Fox moved a motion to 1) identify an IGC subcommittee (one which would replace the IGC Clearinghouse Subcommittee) to address the Clearinghouse Subcommittee's third recommendation, "Investigate options for legal authorization for clearinghouse", and 2) require the subcommittee include a representative from the Department of Lands.

AMENDED MOTION

Discussion points prior to final vote:

- Senator Bunderson stressed that, in order to receive legislative support, this needed to be a coordinated effort.
- Bunderson also noted that benefits to the private sector would be important to the equation.
- Mynar recommended a concise definition (as opposed to the aforementioned six objectives) of a state clearinghouse be included in the MOU.
- Intention of the IGC with regard to the identification of the charge of a state clearinghouse. It was suggested that the steering committee, when identified, should prepare this information for presentation to/approval of the IGC.

Liza Fox moved and Tony Morse seconded a motion to 1) identify an IGC subcommittee (one which would replace the IGC Clearinghouse Subcommittee) to address the Clearinghouse Subcommittee's third

recommendation, "Investigate options for legal authorization for clearinghouse", and 2) include state representation on such, and the motion passed unanimously.

USGS COLLABORATIVE PROJECT

Tracy addressed the Committee.

Discussion points:

- The USGS launched an initiative, including nine pilots, to create the National Map. This initiative was very similar to Lands' Integrated State Lands Project, presented to the ITRMC on February 20, 2002.
 - o Standardized data sets would be produced over the nation and presented seamlessly for visual display, download, and/or plotting/printing.
 - o One of this year's seven national pilots, the **Eastern Washington-Northern Idaho Project**, would include two Idaho counties (Kootenai and Bonner) and two Washington counties (Spokane and Pend Oreille).
 - The USGS received \$70,000 for the project, of which \$10,000 would be given to the State of Idaho.
 - Project goals: 1) to obtain the data and prepare it for use; 2) to involve state agencies in support of counties, as the attempt is made to build a framework data set for Idaho. It should also provide an opportunity to look at framework ideas, such as transportation.
 - o In addition, \$6,000 would be given to the U of I to serve the National Map on the U of I server.
 - o This pilot project would be extended to the rest of the state within a ten-year timeframe.
- Collection and maintenance of structures. Dave mentioned that Kootenai and Bonner counties were within two of Idaho's fire districts, and cited this to be an urban interface problem. He also noted the importance of the group collecting the structures to work closely with the counties in doing so. In response, Tracy advised the USGS could either collect the structures, or help the state collect them. With regard to maintenance of structure data, discussed was Kootenai County's process of notifying appropriate parties when building permits are received; it might be helpful to model or distribute the Kootenai County system throughout other counties.

Liza suggested Tracy work closely with the IGC's framework data committees in the development of statewide standards to ensure they are driven by national standards when appropriate.

REPORTS AND UPDATES

Geospatial Applications Subcommittee:

The Geospatial Applications Subcommittee was established (October 19th IGC meeting) to address ITRMC concerns regarding statewide geospatial standards. Tony, Subcommittee Co-Chair, advised the Subcommittee had defined why standards were needed. Consensus was reached on the following: standards were needed to facilitate data sharing, to avoid redundancy in processing of data, and to facility productivity. A summary of comments from Subcommittee members is as follows:

- GIS data standards, in the context of the State IT Plan, were needed. GIS hardware and software standards were not needed, as there are open file formats that can be produced and read by a variety of different software.
- IGC Technical Working Groups (TWGs) were – and should be – creating specific data standards for individual data themes.
- In the context of the State IT Plan, a general policy was required rather than specific standards.
- Vector and raster spatial data should be output in a standard format, and have the necessary elements to allow other agencies the ability to use the data without reformatting, re-projecting, or recreating the data.

Discussion points:

- Data standards versus software standards. The issue was not the software, rather the data itself.
- Level of importance for standard software implementation in the GIS realm.
- Addressing standards on an enterprise level (city, county, state).
- Local governments' use of statewide standard software.

- The use of different software by GIS professionals for different tasks.

State Tax Commission's 5-Year IT/GIS Plan

The February 7th motion regarding the plan and report presented by the IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control TWG was read aloud:

"SUBSTITUTE MOTION

[Mike] McDowell moved and [Diane] Holloran seconded a substitute motion to accept and endorse in concept the direction of the STC GIS Integration Plan, request a formal written plan be presented to both the Assessor's Association and IGC for consideration, and, if endorsed, forward to ITRMC a positive recommendation for support of the Plan, and the motion passed unanimously."

Cindy Lou McDonald, Idaho State Tax Commission, provided background as to how the project was initiated. Cindy Lou was charged by her commissioners with obtaining a strong recommendation from Idaho's GIS community to move forward with GIS in the State Tax Commission (STC). Over the past year, Cindy Lou had made fourteen presentations to: the IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control TWG, Idaho counties, Federal Geographic Data Committee representatives, and the IGC. A proposal would be presented to the ITRMC on April 24th. The Plan would include both an address database, and a statewide land ownership (parcel) database. The present focus was on the parcel database. At this time, the following entities are separately gathering parcels: the Idaho departments of Water Resources and Lands, USDA Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, and Idaho counties. The STC proposal involves combining all this data into a continuous, seamless coverage for the entire state (per the Plan, participation was voluntary).

Plan purpose: To integrate GIS in the STC for data analysis and to ensure fair and equal taxation; to ensure good use of STC resources; and to perform data mining for legislative and state economic analysis. (The 5-year plan would actually include fourteen different planning and modeling projects.)

Progress made:

- At this year's Idaho Association of Counties Mid-Winter Legislative Conference, assessors voted to support, in concept, a proposal that the STC move ahead as a coordinator of statewide parcel data.
- The IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control TWG approved a proposal to give Lands and STC responsibility for coordination of the statewide cadastral framework data set.

Per the above-mentioned motion, the STC would present a formal written plan to the Assessor's Association in August '02.

Sheldon, alternate for Mike McDowell (Kootenai County), relayed a summary of Mike's comments.

- In general, the IGC Cadastral and Geodetic Control TWG had given the IGC a positive recommendation on the Plan, as it seemed to fit in with the Cadastral Plan. The scope of the Plan was ambitious, but more information needed to be included pertaining to staffing, funding, timeline, etc.
- It was understood that the document, as submitted, was probably sufficient for presentation to the ITRMC for IT program review purposes prior to JFAC budget review.
- No formal written plan had been presented to the Assessor's Association. This was a critical issue, as the subject data that was to be created and maintained by the respective county assessors' offices (which was to be collated and used by the STC for spatial and qualitative analysis, and potentially shared with other state agencies for purposes other than those specified in Idaho code) was under the direct stewardship, and arguably ownership, of the respective county assessors, who were required to fulfill statutory requirements regarding assessment and mapping of parcels. The Plan, as constructed, relied heavily on the voluntary participation of this primary stakeholder group, the Assessor's Association, which had not had the opportunity to review, comment on, and contribute to the specifics of the Plan.
- Without the endorsement of a formal written plan by the Assessor's Association, a positive recommendation for support of the Plan should not be forwarded by the IGC to the ITRMC at this time.

Discussion points:

- Cindy Lou mentioned that the assessors had not asked for a written plan.
- Acknowledging the potential benefit to all local governments, Craig warned that he felt a level of discomfort on the part of the counties about proceeding until needs, resources, benefits, etc. at the local level were explored and documented. Further, the counties were required by statute to maintain parcel information for taxation purposes, but Craig was not aware of a requirement that it be digital. Efforts to do such would negatively affect the counties' general budgets.
- Craig later mentioned that he had previously questioned members of the Tax Commission about the critical need to identify funding at the local level (with regard to the statewide plan), and was advised that it was beyond the scope of the STC.
 - o Cindy Lou pointed out that this element was included in plan number one, year one, of the overall STC Plan, which was to determine a perpetual funding mechanism. Also, it would be up to the Tax Commission to meet the counties' funding needs.
- Janet explained that counties that had developed a GIS data set had invested huge amounts of money to do so. Her commissioners had indicated the need to offset those costs for the benefit of the taxpayer, and would be much more receptive to the STC Plan if such a return was shown.
 - o Cindy Lou advised this concern was also covered in plan number one, year one, of the overall Plan, and that return on investment was expected.
- Based on the recommendations from local government not to go forward with a positive recommendation, Liza inquired as to the IGC's next steps with regard to the STC 5-year IT/GIS Plan.

MOTION TO ACCEPT IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION'S FIVE-YEAR IT PLAN IN CONCEPT

Discussion points prior to final vote:

- Development of a rapid prototype or pilot that may serve as proof of the Plan concept, allow people to readily visualize and, in effect, offer support. Otherwise, there would be a deferred gratification for about two years due to time spent laying the groundwork for the project.
- Lack of presentation to – and endorsement from – the Assessor's Association.
- Voluntary participation aspect of the Plan.
- Importance and potential benefits of this data layer.
- Incentive for local governments to participate.
- Possibility of counties (that had already invested in/developed a GIS data set), with the help of the Tax Commission, assisting other counties with fewer resources to do so.

Senator Bunderson moved and Carol Silvers seconded a motion to 1) endorse the Idaho State Tax Commission's GIS/IT Plan in concept, under the provision that a) local government concerns were addressed, and b) the Assessor's Association endorse the formal plan; and 2) to authorize McDonald to present the Plan to the ITRMC, and the motion passed seven to three, with one abstention.

I-PLAN STATEWIDE VISION

Per a February 7th IGC meeting discussion, the I-Plan vision team developed a draft I-Plan statewide vision statement. After completing this task, the group was to forward the vision statement to IGC TWG members, who would draft respective I-Plans by using the vision as a foundation.

Nathan and Craig drafted the following vision statement:

"Our Vision with this plan is to identify status of Geospatial data by theme in Idaho, develop a prioritization of data needs across the state and resources to accomplish the data development and maintenance."

The two felt the need for more input and assistance from the IGC as to the direction of the statewide vision, particularly as it pertained to Idaho's I-Plan.

Discussion points:

- The vision statement should address why an I-Plan was needed (objective), rather than what it would accomplish (operational).

Liza drafted the following vision statement:

"To seamlessly integrate and share timely and accurate data, expertise, and resources with appropriate parties."

She noted that all the words in the statement would need to be defined. She asked that Craig and Nathan consider bringing on board all IGC TWG chairs to help establish the vision. Craig commented that the TWG chairs had been included in the first meeting of the vision team. Preliminary driving issues identified were: diversity, a common tie to the land, public safety, information needs, and economic development. Again, it was stated that these were operational, not conceptual, issues.

Liza advised the development of the statewide vision statement was absolutely critical to the mission of the IGC, and was necessary for the progression of many projects/programs. Further, a mechanism quickly needed to be put in place to define this vision and develop Idaho's I-Plan in order for the Committee to be effective in responding to agencies across the state.

Discussion points (continued):

- Appropriate way in which the vision statement should be defined.
- Senator Bunderson advised the vision should be a brief statement of what the IGC is trying to achieve.
- Mention of a GIS center in the vision statement.
- Addition of a GIS menu on accessidaho.org.

It was decided an e-mail should be sent to members of the GIS community requesting assistance in the development of Idaho's I-plan statewide vision statement, and that Nathan and Craig continue their work on the matter.

ADJOURNMENT

As time did not allow for any further discussion, Liza thanked those in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. The next Idaho Geospatial Committee meeting would be held in the August/September 2002 timeframe.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gales
ITRMC Assistant